



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Handwritten initials

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/082,483	05/20/98	WHITE	J AKT2253P1 (23

┌

MMC2/0411┐

PATENT COUNSEL
APPLIED MATERIALS
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 450A
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

EXAMINER

LUU, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2824	

2824

DATE MAILED:

04/11/00

Handwritten #12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/082,483

Applicant(s)

White et al.

Examiner

Pho Luu

Group Art Unit

2824



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-28, 30-33, 35-45, and 47-58 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 15, 28, 38, 40, 42-45, 47, and 58 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 2-14, 16-27, 30-33, 35-37, 39, 41, and 48-57 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 8, and 9

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2824

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement submitted on 05/20/1998 was filed after the mailing date of the 08/28 on 1998. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the petition is granted and the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

2. The information disclosure statement submitted on 05/20/1998 was filed after the mailing date of the 04/12 on 1999. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the petition is granted and the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

3. The information disclosure statement submitted on 05/20/1998 was filed after the mailing date of the 08/23 on 1999. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the petition is granted and the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Art Unit: 2824

Drawings

4. The drawing are objected to by the PTO Draftsperson for the reasons noted on the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, form PTO-948.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuno et al. (US 5,505,779)

Regarding to claim 1, Mizuno et al has disclosed an apparatus for performing the process on substrate a conveyor support of path, transfer mechanism configured, removing, processing located the flow path with the valve introduction and extraction (column 5, lines 59-67; column 6, lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the applicant's claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 2824

7. Claims 15, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki et al. (US 5,288,379)

Regarding to claims 15, and 28, Namiki et al discloses an apparatus for performing thin film processing with work flow path, the processing including an exterior, interior, valva for exchange of selected substrate, delivery, removal system, and substrate exchange apparatus is moveable along the flow path between position, retrieved, and returned. (column 8, lines 34-53). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the applicant's claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

8. Claims 38, 40, 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairbairn et al. (US 5,838,121).

Regarding to claims 38, 40, 42-44, Fairbairn et al disclosed an apparatus for performing thin film processing a substrate delivery, removal system, processing of the first, and second load lock chamber with at lest one processing chamber, along with the first position can be retrieved from the delivery, removal system, extraction position, remote with the second load lock. (column 16, lines 43-67; column 7, lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the applicant's claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art,

Art Unit: 2824

discovering the optimum or workable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

9. Claim 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krockner (US 5,961,269).

Regarding to claim 45, Krockner disclosed an apparatus to perform a process on substrate of support the number substrates with work flow path position separated, plurality substrate transfer mechanisms configured, arranged to remove substrate, processing located, processing have two adjacent chambers separated by second pitch on conveyor (column 3, lines 15-29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the applicant's claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

10. Claim 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maydan et al. (US 5,855,681).

Regarding to claim 47, Maydan et al discloses an apparatus to perform a process on the substrate of storage location of the first, plurality of process chamber located to path between first and second processing path, transfer robot movable, deliver to exchange position associated with the selection of the process chamber, degrees, direction of movement (column 8,

Art Unit: 2824

lines 30-67; column 9, lines 1-20) . It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the applicant's claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

11. Claim 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,628,828).

Regarding to claim 58, Kawamura et al discloses an apparatus of performing the process means for storing substrate at the first processing path, plurality of process chambers located adjacent to the processing path between first and second processing path, retrieving a substrate, delivering to exchange position associated with selected on the process chamber (column 2, lines 17-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the applicant's claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 2824

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 2-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 1, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. Claims 16-27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 15, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. Claims 30-33, and 35-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 28, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

15. Claim 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 38, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

16. Claim 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 40, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

17. Claims 48-57 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 47, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2824

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Pho M. Luu whose telephone number is (703)306-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Elms, can be reached on (703) 308-2816. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Pho M. Luu *PL*

Art Unit 2824

April, 2000

**Amir Zarabian
Primary EXaminer**